

7425-113 / 10307148
09/776,174

Remarks

Claims 4-6, 10, 12-15, & 17 generally paralleled the remaining claims but were directed to other formal aspects of the invention (system, apparatus, etc), and have been cancelled in the interest of simplifying the issues currently before the examiner without prejudice to subsequent reintroduction of such claims (or other claims arguably similar in scope to the cancelled claims) in this application or in a subsequently filed continuation.

The non-statutory objection to claims 1-3 is now moot in that the claims are now clearly directed to a "computerized process" involving an "electronic requisition form".

The objection to the word "requisition" is noted. All claims now expressly distinguish between a specific "requisition form" and a more general "requisition process". Similarly, a clear line of distinction has now been made between "review" by a "reviewer" and "approval" by an "approver".

The rejection of all claims as obvious from Gardner is respectfully traversed. In particular, Gardner appears to be related to the processing of a routine purchase request involving catalog-based orders from previously approved vendors and in accordance with previously negotiated terms and conditions; to the extent that Gardner contemplated that a "non-catalog" order could be referred to a "buyer" for "negotiation" (col. 9 lines 14-18), such a referral appears to be an afterthought that is not described in any detail, let alone enabling detail. In contrast, the amended claims are clearly directed to a much more elaborate requisition process (claim 1) and protocol (claim 16) which includes a subsequent negotiated bidding process and which involves both advisory simultaneous reviews and mandatory sequential approvals, as well as an opportunity for withdrawal (claim 1) and/or revision (claim 2) by the originator prior to commencement of the buyer's negotiations, and which also provides real time status information (claim 11) and a permanent audit trail (claim 9). Even if

25339163.4

/425-113 / 10307148

09/776,174

some or all of these particular enhancements are fairly disclosed and enabled in the secondary references (which applicants do not admit), a presumed desire "to obtain world-class practice" is hardly a specific motivation to combine Article 3/1992 (or any other cited article) with Gardner's catalog-based ordering system.

Respectfully submitted,

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI LLP

Dated: 9-23-03By: John M. May
Reg. No. 26,200

Customer No.
000167
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Fulbright & Jaworski L.L.P.
Twenty Ninth 29th Floor
885 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2578
Telephone: (213) 882-8200

25339163.4

7